UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/899,555	07/05/2001	Sadhana S. Rau	16159.010001; P5909	1645

22511	7590	08/24/2005

OSHA LIANG L.L.P.
1221 MCKINNEY STREET
SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER
REFAI, RAMSEY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/899,555	RAU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ramsey Refai	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _06 July 2005_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-37_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _17-36_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-16 and 37_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Responsive to Request for Continued Examination (RCE) received July 6, 2005.

Claims 17-36 have been canceled. Claim 37 is newly presented. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, and 10-16

have been amended. Claims 1-16 and 37 are now presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
> any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
> requirements of this title.

2.   Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to

non-statutory subject matter. The claims are directed to program product on a computer-readable

medium. The term "medium" has multiple definitions and can include signals. Since the

specification fails to define "medium" as a *tangible* medium, the claims are rendered non-

statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claim 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention.

        In claim 1, claim language is not clear as to who is requesting the client to store the

selected data.

        In claim 8, it is not clear what is meant by the limitation "the client sending a request to

the client".

        Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this
> or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

6.   Claims 1, 7, 12, 14-16, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated

by Mendez (U.S. Patent No.6, 151,606).

7.   As per claims 1 and 37, Mendez teaches a method and a computer readable medium

having stored thereon a program, respectively, for propagating changes from a local workspace

that is accessible by a client to a remote workspace that is accessible by a server, comprising:

        creating a temporary local workspace on the client **(abstract; column 4, lines 52-63,**

column 8, lines 24-37);

obtaining selected data from the remote workspace in response to a request from the

client to the server **(abstract; column 4, lines 52-63, column 8, lines 24-37)**;

requesting the client to store the selected data in the workspace from the remote

workspace in the temporary local workspace **(abstract; column 4, lines 52-63, column 8, lines

24-37)**;

updating the local workspace with the data in the temporary local workspace **(abstract;

column 4, lines 52-63, column 8, lines 24-37)**.

8.   As per claim 7, Mendez teach obtaining selected data from the remote workspace

comprises determining a set of different files between the local and remote workspaces

(abstract, column 8, lines 9-51).

9.   As per claim 12, Mendez teach checking for physical existence of the local workspace

and requesting the server to check for physical existence of remote workspace prior to requesting

the client to create the temporary workspace **(abstract, column 4, lines 51-62, column 7, line 65

– column 8, line 8)**.

10.   As per claim 14, Mendez teaches updating history of transactions in the remote

workspace after the local workspace is updated **(column 11, lines 10 – 40)**.

11.   As per claim 15, Mendez teaches updating history of transactions in the local workspace

after the local workspace is updated **(column 11, lines 10 – 40)**.

12.   As per claim 16, Mendez teaches deleting the workspace after the local workspace is

updated **(abstract)**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

14.   Claims 2-6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Mendez (U.S. Patent No. **6,151,606**) in view of Bayeh et al (U.S. Patent No. **6,098,093**).

15.   As per claim 2, Mendez fails to teach at least one servlet parses requests sent to the server

and delegates processing of the requests to an appropriate server object in the server.

16.   However, Bayeh et al teach the use of servlets and servlet engines to facilitate client

requests **(Figure 3 and column 8, line 42 – column 9, line 19)**. It would have been obvious to

one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mendez and Bayeh et al because

Bayeh et al's use of servlets in Mendez system would reduce system overhead and execute

quickly because servlets are automatically threaded and are highly responsive.

17.   As per claim 3, Mendez teach a remote workspace is stored in a repository **(column 4,**

lines 52-63).

18.   As per claim 4, Mendez teaches a server object implements an interface having a set of

methods that can be invoked to access the repository and the remote workspace **(column 2, line**

10 – column 3, line 15).

19.   As per claim 5, Mendez fails to teach the client communicates with the server using

HTTP protocol.

20.   However, Bayeh et al teach the use of HTTP protocols **(column 1, lines 20-30)**.). It

would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of

Mendez and Bayeh et al because Bayeh et al's use of HTTP protocol in Mendez system would

allow for a client to communicate to a server via the Internet to exchange messages.

21.   As per claim 6, Mendez fails to teach the client communicates with the server using

HTTPS protocol.

22.   However, Bayeh et al teach the use of HTTPS protocols **(column 1, lines 20-30)**.). It

would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of

Mendez and Bayeh et al because Bayeh et al's use of HTTPS protocol in Mendez system would

allow for a client to safely communicate to a server via the Internet to exchange messages.

23.   As per claim 13, Mendez teach the use updating the local workspace with the data in the

temporary local workspace **(abstract, column 4, lines 53-63)**.

24.   Mendez fail to teach a server locking method.

25.   However, Bayeh et al teach a server with a locking technique to prevent servlets from overwriting each other **(abstract and column 12, lines 29 – 58)**. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mendez and Bayeh et al because Bayeh et al's use of a locking technique in Mendez system would prevent other users access to remote workspace while the user it obtaining a file or updating a file from the remote workspace.

26.   Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendez (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,606) and in view of Maddalozzo, Jr. et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,878,218).

27.   As per claims 8 - 11, Mendez teaches the use of different files in different workspaces **(abstract)**.

28.   Mendez fail to teach the use filenames and checksums to determine the set of different files, comparing the filenames and checksums, having files with checksums that differs from that of a corresponding filename in the set of different files and having files that include a filename that differs from the set of different files.

29.   However, Maddalozzo, Jr. et al teach the use filenames and checksums to verify file availability, file difference and checksum differences in the set of different files **(column 9, line 15 – column 10, line 47)**. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mendez and Maddalozzo, Jr. et al because Maddalozzo, Jr. et al's use of comparing files using filenames and checksums in Mendez's system would allow a user to obtain a copy of a file from a remote workspace into a temporary workspace, verify that they are different and then modify the file in the temporary workspace. Once modification is complete, a

user can then check file availability in the remote workspace and if not available, transfers file to

the remote workspace and check if the entire file has been transferred using checksums.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 8, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

- In the remarks, the Applicant argues in substance that:

    a.   Mendez fails to teach creating a temporary workspace;

    b.   Mendez fails to teach three distinct types of workspaces;

    c.   Mendez fails to teach propagating changes from the remote workspace to the local

    workspace.

- In response to argument:

    a.   Examiner respectfully disagrees. After further review and consideration, it is

    determined that Mendez does teach the creation of a temporary workspace in order to

    manipulate data. Upon logout, the temporary workspace is deleted. Therefore, Mendez

    meets the scope of the claimed limitation. **(See abstract, column 2, line 22-column 3,**

    line 15).

    b.   Examiner respectfully disagrees because Mendez does teach three distinct types

    of workspaces. For example, Mendez teaches the use of workspace **135,** local workspace

    245, and creation of a temporary workspace to manipulate data without compromising

    local data. Therefore, Mendez meets the scope of the claimed limitation. **(See Figures 1-**

    3, column 2, line 22-column 3, line 15, column 4, lines 39-62).

c.   Examiner respectfully disagrees because Mendez does teach synchronizing data

on a remote workspace with data on a local workspace. Therefore, Mendez meets the

scope of the claimed limitation. **(see column 4, lines 53-62, column 8, lines 10-51,**

abstract).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

a.   Capossela et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,642)

b.   Bodnar et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,831)

c.   Mendez et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,708)

d.   Multer et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,757).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ramsey Refai whose telephone number is (571) 272-3975. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ramsey Refai
Examiner
Art Unit 2152

RR
August 22, 2005

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100